DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 058 493 AA 000 797

AUTHOR	Kennedy, Joseph C.
TITLE	Big City Schools in America: The Views of Superintendents and School Board Presidents.
INSTITUTION	Battle (Mark) Associates, Inc.; President's Commission on School Finance, Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY	President's Commission on School Finance, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	71
NOTE	66p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Boards of Education; Disadvantaged Youth; *Educational Finance; Educational Innovation; Education Vouchers; Equal Education; *Federal Aid; *Inner City; Performance Contracts; School Taxes; *State Aid; State Church Separation; Superintendents; Tax Allocation; *Urban Education

ABSTRACT

Attitudes of the superintendents and school board officials of 25 major cities concerning the operation of their schools were determined. In lengthy discussions, these officials observed that big city schools need massive financial assistance from State and Federal governments, since the local property tax as a base is inadequate, and because the raising of local taxes would hasten the flight to the suburbs. These administrators are also convinced that, for urban schools to receive their "fair share," federal aid must bypass State and municipal agencies and come directly to the urban school systems. They also advocate "more than equal" amounts of money to provide equal educational opportunity for all children; see racial integration as a large problem facing big city schools; consider education vouchers a threat to integration efforts, and favor metropolitanism as an integration method. These officials urge decentralization of big city school systems inclusive of community participation, but exclusive of community control of schools. They oppose the use of public funds for assistance to nonpublic schools. (For related document, see ED 058 473.) (Author/JF)

ED 058 493

Big City Schools in America

The Views of Superintendents and School Board Presidents

Prepared by
Mark Battle Associates, Inc.
and Commission Staff

AA 000 797

Submitted to The President's Commission on School Finance

THIS IS ONE OF SEVERAL REPORTS PREPARED FOR THIS COMMISSION. TO AID IN OUR DELIBERATIONS, WE HAVE SOUGHT THE BEST QUALIFIED PEOPLE AND INSTITUTIONS TO CONDUCT THE MANY STUDY PROJECTS RELATING TO OUR BROAD MANDATE. COMMISSION STAFF MEMBERS HAVE ALSO PREPARED CERTAIN REPORTS.

WE ARE PUBLISHING THEM ALL SO THAT OTHERS MAY HAVE ACCESS TO THE SAME COMPREHENSIVE ANALYSIS OF THESE SUBJECTS THAT THE COMMISSION SOUGHT TO OBTAIN. IN OUR OWN FINAL REPORT WE WILL NOT BE ABLE TO ADDRESS IN DETAIL EVERY ASPECT OF EACH AREA STUDIED. BUT THOSE WHO SEEK ADDITIONAL INSIGHTS INTO THE COMPLEX PROBLEMS OF EDUCATION IN GENERAL AND SCHOOL FINANCE IN PARTICULAR WILL FIND MUCH CONTAINED IN THESE PROJECT REPORTS.

WE HAVE FOUND MUCH OF VALUE IN THEM FOR OUR OWN DELIBERATIONS. THE FACT THAT WE ARE NOW PUBLISHING THEM, HOWEVER, SHOULD IN NO SENSE BE VIEWED AS ENDORSEMENT OF ANY OR ALL OF THEIR FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS. THE COMMISSION HAS REVIEWED THIS REPORT AND THE OTHERS BUT HAS DRAWN ITS OWN CONCLUSIONS AND WILL OFFER ITS OWN RECOMMENDATIONS. THE FINAL REPORT OF THE COMMISSION MAY WELL BE AT VARIANCE WITH OR IN OPPOSITION TO VIEWS AND RECOMMENDATIONS CONTAINED IN THIS AND OTHER PROJECT REPORTS.

The President's Commission
on School Finance

Neil H. McElroy, Chairman
Mary T. Brooks
William G. Colman
Hilda A. Davis
John B. Davis, Jr.
John H. Fischer
Dorothy M. Ford
Norman Francis
Eugene Gonzales
Warren P. Knowles
David H. Kurtzman
Duane Mattheis
William E. McManus
Wendell H. Pierce
William G. Saltonstall
W. B. Thompson
Clarence Walton
Ivan E. Zylstra

Norman Karsh, Executive Director

BIG CITY SCHOOLS IN AMERICA

THE VIEWS OF SUPERINTENDENTS AND

SCHOOL BOARD PRESIDENTS

Survey Conducted by

President's Commission on School Finance
with Mark Battle Associates, Inc.

Joseph C. Kennedy, Survey Director
DeSoto Jordan
Eleanor Brown
Thomas A. Anderson

Report by

Joseph C. Kennedy
President's Commission on School Finance

1971

P R E F A C E

Between the end of June and early September 1971, interviews were conducted with the superintendents and school board presidents of twenty-five major big cities in the United States.*

The purpose of the survey was to talk with those school officials who deal most directly with the problems of the big city schools, to elicit their views not only toward the problems but their views of what might be done to alter the situation.

Prior to June the Commission staff had undertaken the development of an interview guide or questionnaire. Both the National School Boards Association and the Council of the Great City Schools provided valuable assistance at this stage and later in establishing initial contact with the school officials.

Mark Battle Associates, Inc. was contracted by the Commission to provide technical assistance in all aspects of the survey including direct interviewing of these officials.

Superintendents and board presidents were interviewed separately, usually by a two-person team made up of Commission and Mark Battle Associates staff. Initial interviewing or "pre-testing" of the interview guide was conducted in Kansas City, Missouri; Buffalo, New York; and Norfolk, Virginia.

---

*See Appendix

The cooperation and assistance of these superintendents, school board presidents and other school officials in each of the cities were outstanding. What follows is a report of their views and their impressions as determined from discussions which lasted from one-and-a-half to four hours.

Mark Battle Associates and Commission staff participated fully in every aspect of this survey. DeSoto Jordan of MBA contributed greatly to the analysis of data; while Thomas Anderson of PCSF assisted in data analysis and overall preparation of the report. Nonetheless, the writer bears responsibility for the final report. It is sincerely hoped that fairness has prevailed in presenting these views of the superintendents and school board presidents.

The writer expresses gratitude to Dr. Kenneth Buck and August W. Steinhilber of the National School Boards Association; to Samuel B. Husk of the Council of the Great City Schools; and to each of the big city school superintendents and board presidents. A special note of gratitude goes to Norman Karsh, Executive Director of the President's Commission on School Finance for his support and encouragement. Finally, a special thanks to Claire I. Hunkin who typed the report.

Joseph C. Kennedy
President's Commission on
School Finance
10/28/71

SUMMARY

The big city schools, as reflected through the views of the superintendents and board presidents in the 25 major big cities in the country are caught in an ever-tightening web of financial and racial crises.

Relief is needed now — for if it does not come the urban schools may not survive. Relief is needed but the big cities, themselves caught in the same web, cannot provide this relief.

First and foremost these big city schools need massive financial assistance. More money is needed simply to "hold the line," to maintain on-going programs. More money is needed to innovate and create educational approaches which will meet the needs of poor ethnic minority inner-city youths who are being bypassed by a white middle-class-oriented educational system.

This financial relief cannot come from local taxation. Property tax as a base is inadequate and raising taxes or creating new taxes will hasten the suburban flight of businesses and middle-class families.

This financial relief must come from the state and Federal Government. States must take over a much greater share of funding but the school systems must retain decision-making power and overall control.

Financial assistance from the Federal Government must dramatically increase. The big city schools will not get their "fair share,"

however, unless these funds come directly from the federal level to these big city school systems, bypassing state and municipal agencies. At a minimum there would have to be finely drawn pass-through provisions, defined by and at the federal level.

Distribution formulas based on educational need must be developed. Title I compensatory programs for disadvantaged children can be considered unsuccessful only if a very narrow, short-term view of education is taken.

Decisions about the child should be made nearest the child. Big city school systems should move toward greater decentralization; teachers should be held most accountable and judgments about student achievement and promotions should be based on locally-determined norms or standards. There should be community involvement and participation but <u>not community control</u> of the schools.

The top priority in big city schools must be to provide equal educational opportunity for all children. For the inner-city schools with exceptionally high numbers of "disadvantaged" children this means spending "more than equal" amounts of money. This means innovating and developing new programs. Education vouchers <u>should not</u> be one of these innovations. Their use will only lead to resegregation of the schools and a further pulling apart of children from different backgrounds.

Racial integration is still one of the most serious problems facing America's schools. Many of the big city school systems are more and

more comprised of ethnic minority and poor children, with fewer and fewer white and middle-class students. Racial isolation continues.

Integration can be achieved through moving toward metropolitanism -- merging of big cities with surrounding suburbs -- through freer use of transfers, and perhaps through establishing high quality specialized schools in the inner city. But if the schools do not halt the growing isolation of the races, if the schools do not integrate, they will not survive.

Public funds should not be used to aid the nonpublic schools. Rather than providing public funds to assist nonpublic schools, the states should be ready to assist any public school faced with sharp increased enrollments resulting from nonpublic school closings.

Many of the problems of the big city schools cannot be substantially altered until the society itself faces up to and deals with these problems. Nonetheless, given financial resources and a national commitment to urban education, there are definite courses of action which can be taken to raise the quality of education in the big city schools. These courses of action include staff development, development of specialized instructional programs, and educational system reforms.

CONTENTS

		Page
	PREFACE	i
	SUMMARY	iii
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	BUDGETS AND FUNDING	4
III.	DISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS	8
IV.	GOVERNANCE	11
V.	SPECIAL INNER-CITY ISSUES	17
	Equality of Opportunity	17
	Staffing and Instructional Materials	19
	Racial Integration	20
VI.	EDUCATIONAL INNOVATIONS	23
	Education Vouchers	24
	Performance Contracting	25
	Educational Technological Techniques	25
	Other Innovations	26
VII.	NON-PUBLIC SCHOOLS	27
VIII.	SOME COURSES OF ACTION	28
IX.	CONCLUSIONS	33

APPENDIX

Tables

I.	Profile of Big City Schools	35
II.	Budgets and Funding	39
III.	Distribution of Funds	42
IV.	Governance	44
V.	Special Inner-city Issues	47
VI.	Educational Innovations	52
VII.	Non-Public schools	57

454-956 O - 72 - 2

I. INTRODUCTION

During a three-month period in 1971 interviews were conducted with public school superintendents and school board presidents in the 25 major big cities in the U.S.

These 25 cities have in varying degrees all the urban problems which have become so well known and chronicled -- diminished social services, pollution, traffic jams, increased crime rates, decaying buildings, rising taxation, and a subsequent exodus of businesses and middle-class families to the suburbs. The big cities of America are rapidly becoming the home of the black and the brown -- the ethnic minorities: the poor, the unskilled -- the disadvantaged. The survival of urban life in America may be at stake and there are far-reaching political, economic, and social-psychological implications for the Nation as a whole.

Certainly the consequences have been dramatic and immediate for the public and non-public urban schools.

These 25 big city school systems have many of the problems schools all over the country have. But, because of their size, the problems magnify, become larger than life, and indeed become life and death issues. The urban schools in America are faced with a financial crisis and a racial crisis.

These schools range in student-enrollment from 50,000 to over 1 million students and account for a total of 5,345,603 students. Every tenth child attending school throughout the entire U.S. goes to school in one of these 25 big city schools.

The operating budgets of these schools likewise range from nearly 50 million dollars per year to that of New York City which is over 1 billion dollars per year. These 25 school systems each year spend an aggregate of over 6 billion dollars.

They employed (in 1968) 206,236 teachers, fully 10 percent of all teachers in the Nation.

These schools, reflecting the overall phenomenon of the big cities but in heightened form because they are more socially and politically vulnerable, are becoming schools for the ethnic minorities, comprised predominantly of black and brown children and fewer and fewer white children.

The public schools in the Nation's Capital are 95 percent American Black. In San Antonio the public school enrollment is 77 percent Chicano and American Black. New Orleans public schools are 70 percent black, and the Chicago public schools 65 percent black. Of these 25 cities 16 have school systems where ethnic minorities make up

more than 50 percent of the total enrollment. While one-tenth of all public school students in the U.S. are in these public school systems, nearly 33 percent of all ethnic minority children in the U.S. are in these schools. (Table I. A)

There is also the continuing and, in some instances, even expanding racial isolation.

While in some cities such as Memphis and Atlanta the degree of racial isolation has lessened; in places such as New York, Dallas, Philadelphia, Columbus, Ohio and others the public schools are moving toward greater racial separation. (Table I. B)

The President's Commission on School Finance set out to talk directly with the men and women -- the superintendents and board presidents -- who daily on the firing line face, worry about, deal with the great problems facing education in America today, and while many talk of problems, theorize solutions, these big city school officials are called upon to take action and make decisions. Thus the Commission believed it essential to elicit the views and opinions of these officials, views not only about the nature of the problems but, more importantly, views and opinions about what should be done to alleviate and even eliminate the crises and bring quality, and high level education back to America's big city schools.

II. BUDGETS AND FUNDING

Nearly all of these school systems are in deep financial difficulty. There are "hold the line budgets," there are deficits. Many of these schools have moved from "manageable deficits to unmanageable deficits." Programs have been cut. "The only educational planning we can do is planning what to cut back." In one city all athletic programs were curtailed, in another music programs eliminated. One system will propose 3-months of "payless paydays" for its teachers. Another will extend Christmas holidays by 12 days to save money. Hundreds of teachers are being laid off, and hundreds of para-professionals are not being hired. School cafeterias are closed. Money is saved by not cleaning windows or painting. Students are being short changed -- and as one official commented, "Where do you draw the line between fiscal responsibility and educational responsibility?"

The reasons for the financial crises are generally well known. One of the basic reasons is the shrinking property tax base and at a time when the costs of maintaining urban education are rising.

These big city school officials attest to the problems associated with having property tax as the financial base for education.

They say property tax is the prime source of local revenue for their schools and in most instances (62%) it is the sole local source which supports the schools. (Table II. A)

While a few cities already have other taxes which support the schools (income tax, sales tax, commuter tax) most of the respondents agree that these are sources which could be tapped and these new taxes would provide substantial additional revenues to meet the cities' educational needs. (Table II. B, C, D)

Nonetheless, they are reluctant to support the notion that an increase in local taxation is the solution to the problem. They believe the private citizen and the business community are already heavily taxed, that additional taxation would only speed up the retreat of families and businesses to the suburbs, thus further shrinking the tax base. Neither do they believe, as some people have proposed, that a state-wide property tax would help improve the schools' financial situation (and certainly not without state uniformity in assessment and millage rate). By and large they say "the property tax is dead." (Table II. E,F)

One approach which could ease the situation, and which 72 percent of these officials support, would be a move toward metropolitanism -- merging the city and surrounding suburbs as a means of establishing a broader tax base for the support of the city schools. (Table IIG.)

As positive as they are toward merger as a viable approach to improving the financial structure, they are even more enthused about this type of merger as an effort to halt and break down the growing

patterns of racial isolation and separation which exist between the urban poor disadvantaged school children and the affluent white middle-class suburban school children. Many of these school officials see the growing racial, ethnic separation as a much greater crisis than the financial one.

With property tax inadequate as a base, fearful that new local taxes would drive people away, and seeing metropolitanism as desirable but a long time coming, the overwhelming belief among these school officials is that only massive financial assistance from state and Federal Government will alleviate the crisis. They say there is no way to hold costs down. It costs more just to do the same thing, to maintain the same programs, and simply "maintaining" programs does not meet the needs of the urban students. What is needed is money -- money to maintain programs, money to innovate and create new programs -- more money.

State assistance must go way beyond what it is today (a national average of about 40%), and should go up to 75 percent or more. At the same time these school officials would not support the state taking over all financial responsibilities for the schools. (Table II. H)

They very forcefully believe that full state funding (with no local add on) would begin to limit and destroy the local controls and initiatives which are vital to the school system. (Table II. I)

Furthermore, they have little faith in the rural and suburban-oriented state legislatures (which they say have long demonstrated their lack of concern and sympathy for urban problems) to either adequately "full fund" the urban schools, or to be sufficiently aware of the special program needs of the urban schools. "As long as this city is urban and the rest of the state rural, we will not get equal distribution. So long as this city becomes more and more black and decisions rest with the state, we will not get a fair share."

In part, because of this lack of faith in the state legislatures (and also limited faith in the federal government), to respond to the unique special problems of the urban schools, these school officials are strongly opposed (70%) to any federal general revenue-sharing plan which would provide funds to state and municipal governments to be channeled to the cities school systems. They do not believe their schools would get a fair share of these funds.

In fact, the only way the big city school systems will get a fair share of any federal funds is for these funds to go directly from the federal level to the school system itself bypassing the state agencies and, where school systems are fiscally dependent, bypassing the municipal agencies. (Table II. J)

"There must be a direct pass through on all federal funds, and unless the formula is devised in Washington we still won't get a fair share. If the formula is devised by the state the city will get screwed." At

454-956 O - 72 - 3

least one city system has had to sue the state to prevent it from reducing its contribution whenever the city received additional outside funds.

III. DISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS

In addition to the need for an increase in funding, these big city school officials agree that the present distribution of state funds is inadequate. Present state aid formulas do not take cognizance of the special educational needs of urban schools -- needs growing, not only, out of the special characteristics of extremely big cities, but growing as well out of the complex task of attempting to provide high quality education to over 5 million children highly concentrated in small areas, and coming from extremely diverse racial, cultural, social and economic backgrounds.

According to these school officials an inordinate proportion of their students are classified as economically and socially disadvantaged. Many of these officials state that anywhere from 40 to 100 percent of their student body are disadvantaged. (Table III. A)

Still most states do not provide special educational assistance to these big city schools. (Table III. B)

These schools do receive the same special purpose or categorical aid funds which all systems throughout the state receive. The most

frequently funded categories are: special education, transportation, vocational education, and driver education. In many of these schools remedial reading is also specially funded.

These officials have mixed feelings about the categorical funds they are receiving, with some saying these earmarked funds prevented them from responding to more urgent needs, and others claiming that unless funds are earmarked for special education or vocational education, etc., these areas would be even more neglected. Still, according to these officials even those activities which are funded are not adequately funded. The only activity which may be adequately funded, and about which there may be questions concerning funding in general is driver education. (Table III. C)

What the superintendents and board presidents would like to see is the development of alternative patterns of distribution. Ninety percent of them agree that funds should be distributed based on educational need rather than by a formula which implies that all children have the same needs, or that it costs the same to educate the child no matter where he is. Eighty-five percent also support distribution which would give more money where there are low-income families, or distribution based on overall socio-economic status. They do not support distribution related to achievement test scores, feeling this approach could become an incentive for or reward for negative performance, and might lessen the drive for improvement. (Table III. D)

Additionally, they would like to have more general purpose aid to bring about the changes they think are necessary. (Table III. E) One of the first priorities would be to revise curriculum to make it more realistic, more relevant, more responsive to the needs of these urban students. Combined with curriculum revision would be the development of new programs.

Heavy emphasis would be given to the development of specialized reading programs, intensive learning programs, and individualized instruction. Pre-school education programs, combined with parental education, would also receive high priority. Additionally, greater stress would be placed on quality vocational schools designed to prepare students with "marketable" skills, such as computer programing, electronics, etc., and greater career planning and counseling throughout. Finally, human relations programs would be provided training administrators, teachers and students so they can better interact with each other.

These administrators, incidentally, in general do not agree with what appears to be a growing concensus that the compensatory education programs for the disadvantaged have not worked. (Table III. F)

They say these compensatory programs haven't worked only "if you take the narrow view of academic achievement....but they have done untold good for the youngsters."

They say bi-lingual programs have worked and reading centers have worked. They say "so many good things have come out of these

programs that can't be measured -- the field trips for the inner-city child, the cultural affairs, the greater hiring of para-professionals and the development of citizens advisory groups. We are talking about humans not machines."

Where compensatory programs have not worked is where "the strictures from Washington have been too tight," or when "the same teachers who have already messed up in the regular programs end up working in these programs and mess up again."

IV. GOVERNANCE

One of the great issues facing urban schools is the degree of state, local, and community control and overall manageability of the schools. Where a school system expands over 711 square miles, where a school system has 32 percent ethnic minority students but only 5 percent ethnic teachers, where a school system has more teachers than over 99 percent of the school systems in the country have students, the question of who controls and who should control the schools becomes extremely cogent.

Although a number of superintendents and board presidents question whether the big city schools are manageable, 60 percent agree that they are manageable. "They are hell -- but they are manageable." They say size per se is not the decisive factor when considering manageability and "there can be chaos in a small system." One of the consequences

of bigness is the difficulty in communicating with staff, lack of contact with students, and "longer response time to any situation." (Table IV. A)

In running these schools, these officials report they spend most of their time dealing first with educational policy considerations (programs, etc.), and then with local community concerns. They spend much less direct time with revenue and tax problems, and teacher contract negotiations because many of these large school systems have hired experts to deal with these matters. (Table IX. B)

Turning to state, local and community levels of control, it has already been pointed out that, though these big city school officials want greater financial assistance from the state, they feel they must retain control at the local level in order to be sensitive to, and responsive to the needs of their students and the community.

Among the controls they feel most strongly about retaining at the local level are the hiring and firing of teachers -- 94 percent say this authority must be retained, 92 percent say decisions pertaining to curriculum must also be retained, and 88 percent say pupil-teacher ratio decisions must remain at the local level.

While they believe some other decisions are less important to retain, nonetheless, they still feel strongly they should be retained -- decisions about facilities, about salary schedules, and about teacher qualifications. (Table IV. C)

While wanting to retain decisions relating to salary schedules, they are rather divided as to whether establishment and negotiation of teacher salaries at the state level is desirable and most agree it would be difficult to establish a state-wide salary scale. **(Table IV. D)**

They feel less strongly about the retention of decisions pertaining to teacher qualifications since most states already set certification standards. Fifty-eight percent say the state should establish standard teacher qualifications and take the responsibility for bringing all teachers up to that standard, but they also realized that by holding the right to hire and fire teachers they do in actuality decide locally whether a teacher is qualified for a particular position. (Table IV. E)

In summary thus these big city school officials feel strongly that regardless of where funds come from they must retain control of many decisions and functions in order to be responsive to the particular educational needs of their communities. But what of those communities they serve? What about community involvement? Community control?

In a near unanimous voice, 98 percent of these superintendents and board presidents agree that "one of the major efforts of the big city schools should be to strengthen parent and community group involvement in the schools."

Over 80 percent agree the community should be involved in curriculum determinations and in decisions about pupil-teacher ratios. Seventy

percent or more agree they should be involved in the selection of superintendents and principals and to a lesser extent in decisions about teacher qualifications. They are not so sure the community should be involved in the hiring and firing of teachers, nor in establishing salary schedules. Nonetheless, they give overwhelming support to the involvement of the community in running the affairs of the schools. (Table IV. F)

Yet, they totally change their affirmations when community involvement changes to community control. Involvement -- Yes. Final decision making authority, control -- No. To this they would not agree.

Consistent with this view of the role of the local community, while they agree that schools should move toward greater decentralization in order to achieve greater educational effectiveness, they prefer a centralized school system over schools run with local community control. (Table IV. G)

While admitting local community control really has not been tried or given a fair chance, they express fears that there would be lack of uniformity and standards across systems. One of the outstanding reasons advanced for not turning the running of the schools over to the communities however, is that those who have decision making authority must be in the position to be held accountable, "With final authority must go legal responsibility." The superintendent

of schools has authority and can be held accountable. He can be fired. School board officials, whether appointed or elected, can be held accountable, they can be removed from office.

But the people of the community can only be held accountable in a collective sense and thus in actuality cannot be held accountable. No one really becomes responsible for what happens in the schools.

Additionally, they say, authority and educational accountability must also be linked to budgetary accountability. (Here they say lies the fault with fiscally dependent school systems -- school officials are held accountable for what happens in the schools but they do not control their budgets -- they can't levy taxes -- and whoever controls the money controls the school system -- thus the animosity toward the rural and suburban dominated state legislatures, toward municipal governments where schools are fiscally dependent, and toward federal government which proposes a revenue scheme which gives money to the state and municipalities.)

Furthermore, these school officials see the school board as the "voice of the people." They say if there is decentralization and the school board is close to the people, the people will have authority. (This might be questioned when it is realized that school boards traditionally have 8 or 10 members -- New York City has 9, Chicago has 11, Los Angeles has 7.) They say boards of education should reflect the ethnic and socio-economic composition of the community (92%)

454-956 O - 72 - 4

and 74 percent say school board officials should be elected. Ironically, 24 percent are opposed to elected school boards because they say in the big cities elected school boards will not represent a cross-section of the people -- there will be no minority representation and they will not be representative of the people's views. In fact, those elected school board officials will be the "elite" of the larger community, those who have both time and money to stand for election. They say the most representative school board -- one that really reflects the ethnic compositions and views of the community — is that one appointed by an executive official who is political and tuned to the ethnic and cultural diversities of his constituents. (Table IV. H)

Furthermore, they do not perceive the community itself, or the pressures of the community, as being the focal point for change in the schools. The person or groups who are most likely to influence educational change are the superintendents, school boards and other professionals.

Given their views toward the state and the controls which must be retained at their local levels, and their views that the local communities should be involved but not have control, the school superintendents and school board presidents -- for better or worse -- have put themselves squarely in the middle between the state from which they need additional financing and the community they serve and from whom they must have support.

V. SPECIAL INNER-CITY ISSUES

Equality of Opportunity

These superintendents and board presidents have forcefully declared that providing equal educational opportunity to the children of the inner city should be a top priority. Ninety percent agree with this even while acknowledging the disproportionate numbers of disadvantaged children will require spending "extra" money. They also endorse "support services" for these children -- school lunches, health services, and even clothing -- where necessary. These services should be part of local health and welfare programs rather than coming out of regular education funds. (Table V. A, B)

They believe these children should remain in school, that education should be compulsory for all children through age 16 or 17 in the inner-city school.

They don't believe a lowered compulsory age should be used to push those perceived hard-to-educate students into the streets -- nor do they believe the compulsory age level should be used just to keep them in school. Keep them in school, but the schools must learn how to give these inner-city youths what they need and not what an outmoded school system thinks they need. They could receive what they need "inside or outside" the school. "They could take leave from school or be given credit for successful work-life experiences. The whole concept of dropouts could be done away with." (Table V. C)

And who should judge these students? By what standards should they be compared and by what standards promoted? These urban students they say,

as with all students, should be judged by standards that are locally set.

Students should be promoted based on how they do on local norms or even special norms, but, most importantly, they should be assessed and promoted based on factors that include more than just "achievement" as measured on tests. Eighty percent agree with this, but many add, however, there really should not be "promotions." Children are in school for "education and socialization" and should move at their own rate in ungraded groups or classes. Consistent with this view, neither should the effectiveness nor efficiency of the schools be measured by student progress on achievement tests. (Table V. D, E)

These officials are adamantly opposed (84%) to promotions based on comparing students against national norms or state norms (78%), just as they are opposed to a national assessment program which would establish national norms and attempt to bring all children up to that level. However, it would be alright for the state to establish minimum accepted achievement levels. (Table V. F, G)

Their views concerning who should set the standards for students are quite consistent with their views of accountability. Norms should be locally set, students judged on factors other than just "achievement," and the teacher should be held most accountable. At the same time -- somewhat ironically -- they say pupil improvement in achievement levels should be <u>one</u> of the factors used in evaluating teachers for salary and promotion purposes. (Table V. H)

After the teacher — in order of accountability -- comes the principal, the superintendent, the parents, the school board, students, and, least accountable of all, the chief state official. (Table V. I)

Interestingly, the theme which runs consistently through so many of the views of these school officials is that decisions about the schools and the students should be made nearest the child. Local controls and initiatives must be retained regardless of other roles of the state, decisions about student success and promotion should be based on local standards, and the person closest to the student -- the teacher -- should be most accountable. This theme is present in the move toward decentralized school systems. The theme is broken only with the issue of community control. Most school officials are not willing to go that last step which would bring the decision making process to the point closest of all to the students.

Staffing and Instructional Materials

Having said the teacher should shoulder greatest accountability for what the child does, the criticalness of the problem facing the inner-city schools becomes extremely clear when 83 percent of the officials then agree that "by and large teachers are inadequately prepared to handle the problems of the inner-city school." (This is additionally critical when it is realized that teacher salaries make up nearly 80 percent of all instructional costs.) Though 60 percent agree that instructional materials used in the schools do not reflect the ethnic composition of the students

most (62%) do not believe "the composition of the teaching staff should be comparable to that of the student population in a particular school." They say staff should be integrated and, even if there is an all-black or all-white student body, the staff should still be ethnically mixed. (Table V. J, K, L)

To remedy the situation though, the majority (82%) agree that for teachers who are preparing to teach in the inner-city schools practice teaching in these schools should be mandatory and in-service programs should be mandatory for all teachers in the inner-city schools. (They add though that in-service programs should be mandatory for all teachers wherever they are.) Also, 94 percent support adding greater numbers of para-professionals to supplement the work of these teachers. (Table V. M, N, O)

Racial Integration

These big city school officials are struggling to bring higher quality education and equal educational opportunity to the children of these inner-city schools. They say "unless we find a way to integrate this society, we will not survive as a nation." Yet, desegregation of the schools moves slowly and, in fact, in many sections of the country -- North and South — the school populations are growing more racially separated, more racially isolated.

Efforts have been made in some cities to establish high quality schools in the inner city, or on the periphery, to attract students back from the suburbs and to create greater racial interaction.

While individual cases were cited whereby a specialized art school or science school had drawn students from both the inner city and surrounding suburbs, these administrators are not certain this approach will work. (Table V. P)

There is little uncertainty though that students attending the inner-city schools should be able to transfer freely so they can attend any school of their choice. (Many of these school systems have a "majority-minority transfer" scheme at work now. Any student who finds himself in a school with a majority of any ethnic group, can receive a transfer.) (Table V. Q)

At the heart of the question of student transfers and the emotionally explosive "busing" is the fear on the part of white middle-class parents that the quality of education their "advantaged" children receive will suffer.

These administrators disagree. In terms of <u>overall educational effectiveness</u> they say that where there are racially mixed classes the effect is positive for both the advantaged and the disadvantaged -- but the group which receives the greatest benefit is the advantaged children (78% agree the effect is positive for the advantaged and 76% agree it is positive for the disadvantaged -- but 30% say it is

extremely positive for the advantaged compared to 16% who say this for the disadvantaged.)

Here again, as in other instances, they return to the theme of race and integration and the need for children of different backgrounds to come together. "The problem is how to get kids — black and white -- to live together....there's more to it than reading and writing. If you carry a heart full of hate, what do you do with that reading and writing."

In terms of achievement however, while the majority still agree the effect is positive for both the advantaged and disadvantaged (72% for the disadvantaged and 56% for the advantaged), these officials move closer to the generally accepted educational dogma that the disadvantaged benefit while the most one can say for the advantaged is they don't slip backwards. (Table V. R)

The complexities, the confusions, the uncertainties, and, perhaps, the weary futility over school desegregation are pinpointed in the response to the question, "Speaking of racially integrated schools what percentage mix do you think would give the best overall educational results?" Exactly half of these officials say that the percentage mix is not the important factor, that attitude, and social complexities of the city are more important.

But for those who did offer a particular percentage mix, the problem the Nation's big city schools face is laid bare. The only way to

have and retain racially mixed schools -- black and white mixed schools — is for there to be a white majority — and a fair-sized white majority. "If you could say there will never be more than 20-30 percent black students, the whites would stay. If you could say white students will always be in the majority they would stay. But if whites think they will be in the minority, you have white flight -- they will scatter like fleas."

But many of these big city schools already have, or are rapidly approaching, the situation where the majority of students are ethnic minorities. If what these officials say holds true the die of total racial separation has already been cast and these big city schools will move inexorably to that final end where the urban school populations over the country will be all black and brown.

VI. EDUCATIONAL INNOVATIONS

The big city officials had already stated, in regard to higher levels of general aid and in regard to other issues, that they would institute curriculum changes, and specialized programs, hire more para-professionals, and so on.

Their responses to some of the more talked about special innovative schemes were not quite so favorable.

Education Vouchers

These administrators (84%) are vehemently opposed to education vouchers, both as a general approach to be tried, and as a specific technique to be used in inner-city schools (78% opposed). Neither do they believe the use of education vouchers would make innovation in the schools easier. (Table VI. A, B)

Their comments were (in the West), "The Birchers are waiting for this.... already planning for the day this happens." And (in the South), "The KKK is waiting for a good voucher plan to come through....that's the old South." And others commented, "This would be the greatest menace to the schools. It would set us backward 15 years." Or, "Vouchers would let public education go down the drain and no one would bleed for the black child."

The only other thing the use of education vouchers would do, 84 percent say, would be to make easier the support of education in the non-public schools (and most are opposed to this kind of support).

This negativism toward vouchers carries over even to the transfer of students or where students could attend school with these vouchers. While most agree that if vouchers were used students should be able to go to any public or private school in the city or in the suburbs, their strong feelings in favor of transfers (expressed earlier) did not come through here reflecting the total lack of enthusiasm for education vouchers. (Table VI. C)

Performance Contracting

Likewise, these school officials are really not sure about performance contracting. In some instances where performance contracting had been used they were pleased — not so much by what had been accomplished but rather because their use "will create an atmosphere of change." In other cases where contracts had been used they were displeased.

At best they are lukewarm about utilizing performance contracting. Exactly half agree its use would affect student achievement, but then they were nearly equally split as to whether this achievement would be realized at higher or lower per-pupil expenditure. All in all though, they think the use of performance contracting would require spending more money.

Ironically (given the lukewarmness of their reactions), the only aspect of performance contracting about which they believe strongly is that performance contracting would provide a basis for accountability. (Table VI. D, E)

Educational Technological Techniques

These administrators strongly support a greater use of technological techniques. The use of educational television should be greatly increased (88% agree), as should computer teaching techniques (82%), programed instruction (88%), and general audio-visual aids (96%). Also 94 percent believe the development of "Sesame Street" type programs to be used in the inner-city schools should be given top priority. (Table VI. F, G)

While supporting a greater utilization of these technologies, they indicated these technologies are not widely used in their schools, especially computer techniques and programed learning. (Table VI. H)

They do not believe that the use of these techniques has reduced costs per pupil though, nor do they believe these technological devices have "depersonalized education." (Table VI. I)

Other Innovations

These administrators believe every child should have the opportunity to receive pre-school education, beginning generally at age 3 or 4, and 26 percent say this education should begin at age 1 or 2. (Table VI. J, K)

Ninety-six percent agree that in the inner city community schools which would serve as the focal point for community needs, should be developed. Not only would the school educate the children, but an integrated approach to community development would be engendered -- responding to educational needs, housing needs, welfare, economic development, and so on. (Table VI. L)

Sixty-two percent support the idea that a fixed percentage of all funds provided to inner-city schools should be set aside for new experimental programs. (Table VI. M)

The number supporting the need for experimentation is actually much higher, but some officials had problems designating a "fixed percentage" being set aside.

An approach which has been suggested which might keep students in school and reduce the high dropout rate is to pay a financial incentive to poor families for every child who remains in school and finishes high school. With this they disagree. (Table IV. N)

VII. NON-PUBLIC SCHOOLS

These big city public school officials, by and large, are not in favor of public funding of non-public schools. They do not accept the argument that the taxpayer would get a better break by supporting the non-public schools before they close rather than paying for the absorption of these students into the public schools if or when they close. (Table VII. A)

Not only do 80 percent believe that the states should be ready to assist any public school faced with sharp increased enrollments resulting from the closing of non-public schools (as opposed to providing funds to keep these non-public schools open), but 74 percent also agree that the public schools can absorb the non-public school students (if these schools close down). (Table VII. B, C)

VIII. SOME COURSES OF ACTION

Most of these big city school officials agree (72%) that any truly substantial changes in the inner-city schools must be tied to massive efforts to raise the socio-economic level of the entire inner-city community.

"The number one problem of the central city is poverty. We must eliminate the intense poverty we deal with and make the central city more desirable to live in. We must eliminate the separation of our people. It takes all kinds of people to make a complete community and in the cities we don't have all kinds of people anymore."

Nonetheless, with two preconditions, there are definite courses of action which can be taken now to improve the quality of education received by the inner-city school child.

The preconditions are money and commitment, "We can't do it without money. Any major goal this country has set for itself has been reached by providing the resources — whether it was Vietnam or going to the moon. We need to set education as a top priority." And, "Right now urban education is not a high priority. We must get a commitment from the President that improving urban education is the number one priority for the Nation -- and then act accordingly."

Given the resources and the commitment there are three broad areas of attack these school officials would take: staff development, specific instructional programs and system reform. The course of action most

frequently advanced was staff development -- teachers and administrators. "We need to tool up for in-service education of school employees, starting with administrators. Sixty percent of elementary principals have no experience below the fifth grade level, and many were physical education and vocational teachers in seventh and eighth grades." Already these officials had commented that by and large teachers are not adequately prepared to handle the problems of the inner-city schools.

What is needed is better and different kinds of educational preparation. The running of the school must be put on more efficient footing. Management techniques and skills must be infused throughout the system and teachers must have higher levels of skill training. "Schools should be managed like any other corporation. We need to develop trained leaders — trained in cost effective techniques and resource identification." And each school system ought to "study itself and bring in outside knowledgeable people for help."

At the same time, many of these school officials see a need for a change in attitude on the part of school personnel. "We must make staff training in human relations programs mandatory." One of the great failings in the inner city is the "inability of people to deal with people." "Everybody must get involved in order to appreciate the dignity of mankind and the responsibilities they have to each other." Administrators must be skilled in and must become "urban education leaders," and teachers must become more sensitive and compassionate. The entire educational staff and the "system" itself must begin to develop attitudes

of equality, attitudes which enable teachers and administrators to perceive children (and adults) who come out of the inner city as equal human beings. We must "eliminate hate for kids. They must be loved by the older generation." Training must be aimed at eliminating institutionalized racism which prevails throughout so much of the system.

The next broad course of action which these officials would take is the development of specialized instructional programs, especially pre-school and early childhood education programs, specialized reading programs, and higher quality vocational education programs.

Believing that the very early years of life are extremely important in the development of intellectual and achievement styles, these officials say the schools should be involved with a child almost from the time he walks. Pre-school should start as early as the child's first or second year and certainly by year three. Many of the achievement disparities which show up as part of the "disadvantaged" child's development in elementary school began in early childhood as an outgrowth of socio-economic disadvantages. These early childhood programs should include both child and parent education.

The development of specialized reading programs are also extremely important. Most reports of reading achievement levels of urban school children are generally rather dismal and point to the inability of teachers and the educational structure to drastically raise the reading achievement of these students. Once they fall behind they rarely catch up. Yet this skill is the key to advancement in all academic areas of education. The ability to read is an integral part of equal educational opportunity.

Quality vocational education programs must be developed, these officials say. Vocational education should include technical training, including training for "sophisticated occupations" and should be very closely tied in with future labor market needs. The concept of "vocational education" should be changed. Every student, regardless of future plans, i.e., college, should have acquired a marketable skill by graduation.

The third broad course of action proposed by these big city school officials deals with restructuring the educational system itself -- starting with the question of education for what.

There must be a rethinking of "what constitutes becoming educated." The schools must deal with the questions of where education takes place, who are the key persons in the educational process, and what is the role of the parents and the community.

"We must redefine the goals of education. Why are we sending kids to school? What are future goals? Moonshots on TV are way ahead of school programs. We are still preparing kids for the assembly line."

There must be more alternative paths for "becoming educated" open to the child and parents. Alternatives must be developed inside and outside the classroom including such things as independent study, work-study programs, and senior high options.

Curricula must be restructured so there is much more openness and freedom, greater flexibility and greater responsiveness to student's individual needs. More para-professionals should be used and differentiated staffing patterns developed.

"Efforts must be made to get the community thinking about educational alternatives." Special summer school programs for the inner-city child should be developed. Year round, 12-month schools should be developed along with community schools.

The community school, in addition to providing instruction for its students, would serve as a focal point for all community services -- health, adult education, welfare, recreation, etc. The community school concept embodies greater citizen participation and involvement in all the affairs of the community including greater involvement in the educational process.

Finally, in terms of restructuring the educational system, teacher training colleges and schools of education must also revise their approaches to training teachers for the inner city. These schools must relate themselves and their training to the community. There must be more in-service training, more continuous training, and much more involvement with and in the community. The great need in the urban schools is for teachers who are highly skilled in their subject areas but who also are sensitive to the ethnic and cultural diversities of their students. The old techniques of teacher preparation in irrelevant isolation will not produce the kinds of teachers and human beings necessary to do the job.

IX. CONCLUSIONS

The big city schools in America are caught in an ever-tightening financial and racial crises and the two are inextricably bound together. Relief is needed now for if it does not come the urban schools may not survive.

These big city schools need massive financial assistance. This financial assistance must come from the state and Federal Government. It cannot come from increased local taxation. The property tax is inadequate and raising local taxation or creating new taxes will only hasten the suburban flight of business and middle-class families which in turn will increase the financial problems and intensify the racial crisis. The states must take over a much greater share of school funding and financial assistance from the Federal Government must dramatically increase.

The financial crisis cannot be separated from the racial crisis however. Racial integration is still one of the most serious problems facing America's schools. If the schools do not halt the growing isolation of the races, if the schools do not integrate they will not survive. Thus a response to the financial crisis no matter how dramatic cannot become an opiate creating an illusion of response to the racial crisis.

The big city schools, as schools throughout the country, are on the firing line because they are highly visible, but the schools only

reflect the society. Many of the problems faced by the schools will be remedied only as they are remedied in the larger society.

The big city schools are rapidly becoming schools comprised of the black, the brown, the poor, the dispossessed. Yet, in a democratic society the top priority must be to provide quality education and equal educational opportunity to all children. The fundamental question is whether that American society which has helped create the educationally dispossessed can now reverse itself and pay whatever the extra cost and take whatever the extra steps to right the situation and to make equal educational opportunity a reality for all children.

APPENDIX

TABLE I - PROFILE OF BIG CITY SCHOOLS

PROFILE

1. Respondents: Superintendents 25 Board Presidents 25

2. Twenty-five Cities (500,000 or more population)

New York*	Los Angeles	Baltimore*	San Diego
Philadelphia	Houston	Milwaukee	New Orleans
Cleveland	Washington, D.C.*	Atlanta	Boston*
Memphis*	St. Louis	Denver	Gary
Columbus, Ohio	Indianapolis	Newark*	
San Francisco*	Seattle	Detroit	
San Antonio	Chicago*	Dallas	(*See No. 7.)

3. Regional Breakdowns --

Region	No. of School Systems
East	6
South	6
Midwest	8
Far West	5

4. Student Enrollments (90,000 or more students.**)

Total Enrollments: 5,345,603
(**San Antonio, Gary, Newark, Seattle added as special cases.)

5. Ethnic Composition --

% Minority Enrollment	No. of School Systems
90-100%	1
80-90%	1
70-80%	3
60-70%	8
50-60%	3
	(16)
40-50%	2
30-40%	3
20-30%	4
10-20%	0

6.

Budgets	No. of School Systems
$250 million and above	5
100-200 million	9
50-100 million	11

7. Fiscal-Dependency - Independency

Independent	-	Dependent*
17		8

TABLE I. A - ETHNIC COMPOSITION OF PUBLIC SCHOOLS IN PCSF BIG CITY SURVEY

City	Total Students	% Negro	% Spanish Surnamed	% Am. Ind.	% Or.	% Total Minority	% Non-Minority
New York	1,140,359	34.5	25.7	0.1	1.4	61.7	38.3
Los Angeles	642,895	24.1	21.8	0.2	3.5	49.6	50.4
Chicago	577,679	54.8	9.8	0.1	0.7	65.4	34.6
Detroit	284,396	63.8	1.4	0.1	0.2	65.5	34.5
Philadelphia	279,829	60.5	3.1	0.0	0.0	63.6	36.4
Houston	241,139	35.6	14.4	0.1	0.5	50.6	49.4
Baltimore	192,458	67.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	67.1	32.9
Dallas	164,736	33.8	8.5	0.3	0.1	42.7	57.3
Cleveland	153,619	57.6	1.9	0.1	0.1	59.7	40.3
Memphis	148,304	51.5	0.0	0.0	0.1	51.6	48.4
Washington, D.C.	145,330	94.6	0.4	0.0	0.5	95.5	4.5
Milwaukee	132,349	26.0	3.1	0.4	0.2	29.7	70.3
San Diego	128,783	12.4	10.6	0.2	2.0	24.6	75.4
St. Louis	111,233	65.6	0.2	0.0	0.1	65.9	34.1
New Orleans	109,856	69.5	1.6	0.1	0.2	71.4	28.6
Columbus, Ohio	109,329	26.9	0.2	0.0	0.2	27.3	72.7
Indianapolis	106,239	35.8	0.4	0.0	0.0	36.2	63.8
Atlanta	105,598	68.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	68.7	31.3
Denver	97,298	14.7	22.4	0.4	0.8	38.3	31.7
Boston	96,696	29.8	4.3	0.1	1.7	35.9	64.1
San Francisco	91,150	28.5	13.6	0.2	20.8	63.1	46.9
Seattle	83,924	12.8	1.6	0.7	5.2	20.3	79.7
Newark	78,456	72.2	13.3	0.0	0.2	85.7	14.3
San Antonio	77,253	15.3	61.5	0.0	0.3	77.1	22.9
Gary	46,695	64.7	9.1	0.1	0.1	74.0	26.0

Source: HEW, Office for Civil Rights, 1970 -36-

TABLE I. B - RACIAL ISOLATION IN TWENTY-FIVE BIG CITY PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEMS

City & Percent of Minority Enrollment	% of Minority Students in Predominantly (90% or more) Minority Schools Fall, 1970	% of Non-Minority Students in Predominantly (90% or more) Non-Minority Schools Fall, 1970	Percent of Racial Isolation[1]
New York (61.7)	57.0	16.8	41.7
Los Angeles (49.6)	60.4	47.6	53.9
Chicago (65.4)	77.4	51.6	68.6
Detroit (65.5)	72.1	44.6	62.7
Philadelphia (63.6)	68.9	52.0	62.8
Houston (50.6)	57.9	51.5	54.8
Baltimore (67.1)	79.2	47.1	68.7
Dallas (42.7)	76.5	68.8	72.2
Cleveland (59.7)	86.4	70.8	80.2
Washington, D.C. (95.5)	94.3	10.2	90.7
Milwaukee (29.7)	53.6	77.6	70.5
San Deigo (24.6)	30.4	53.0	47.5
Memphis (51.6)	89.1	79.8	84.6

[1]Percent of racial isolation is calculated by combining the number of minority students in 90 percent or more minority schools with the number of white students in 90 percent or more white schools and dividing by the total enrollment. The percent is indicative of the proportion of students in any city who have been segregated from other races and ethnic groups in their school experience. Comparing the percent of racial isolation with the percent of minority students in 90 percent or more minority schools, it can be seen that in most of the selected cities minority students are isolated to a greater degree. In Indianapolis, Seattle, and Boston, where minority students are only about one-third of the enrollment, the white students are isolated to a greater degree.
Data from HEW, Office of Civil Rights.

Table I. B

City & Percent of Minority Enrollment	% of Minority Students in Predominantly (90% or more) Minority Schools Fall, 1970	% of Non-Minority Students in Predominantly (90% or more) Non-Minority Schools Fall, 1970	Percent of Racial Isolation
St. Louis (65.9)	82.3	73.3	79.3
Atlanta (68.7)	77.9	44.3	67.4
New Orleans (71.4)	76.6	30.1	63.3
Columbus, Ohio (27.3)	44.6	67.6	61.4
Indianapolis (36.2)	54.9	63.7	60.6
Denver (38.3)	20.5	21.3	21.0
Boston (35.9)	47.5	59.1	55.0
San Francisco (63.1)	19.0	0.0	12.1
Seattle (20.3)	2.1	66.5	53.5
San Antonio (77.1)	58.0	0.0	44.7
Newark (85.7)	79.0	0.0	67.8
Gary (74.0)	79.0	39.8	68.9

TABLE II - BUDGETS AND FUNDING

A. All property tax accounts for about what percent of the total local revenue?

Percent of Local Revenue	Number	Percent
100	31	62.0
90-99	4	8.0
80-89	4	8.0
70-79	1	2.0
60-69	2	4.0
50-59	2	4.0
49 or less	2	4.0
no response	4	8.0
TOTAL	50	100.0

B. What sources of local revenue now exist for schools?

Sources	Number	Percent
Property tax (Business and residence)	48	96.0
Personal income tax	4	8.0
Business income tax	7	14.0
Commuter tax	2	4.0
Sales	4	8.0
Business occupancy	2	4.0
Auto excise	1	2.0

C. What other sources of local revenues could be tapped, given legislative approval?

Sources	Number	Percent
Personal income tax	29	58.0
Business income tax	26	52.0
Sales tax	26	52.0
Commuter tax	20	40.0

D. These sources could provide substantial additional revenues to meet the city's educational needs.

	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not Applicable	Total
Number	27	7	2	7	7	50
Percent	54.0	14.0	4.0	14.0	14.0	100.0

Table II.

E. Relief to property taxes should be financed by?

	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Answer	Total
Other local taxes						
Number	18	6	8	14	4	50.0
Percent	36.0	12.0	16.0	28.0	8.0	100.0
Additional state assistance						
Number	35	10	0	2	3	50
Percent	70.0	20.0	0.0	4.0	6.0	100.0
Additional federal assistance						
Number	34	9	0	3	4	50
Percent	68.0	18.0	0.0	6.0	8.0	100.0
Cutting back on programs						
Number	1	2	4	38	5	50
Percent	2.0	4.0	8.0	76.0	10.0	100.0

F. A statewide property tax would help improve the financing of city schools.

	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Answer	Total
Number	10	8	9	18	5	50
Percent	20.0	16.0	18.0	36.0	10.0	100.0

G. How would you feel about merging the city and surrounding suburbs into regions with a broader tax base.

	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Answer	Total
Number	27	9	7	5	2	50
Percent	54.0	18.0	14.0	10.0	4.0	100.0

Table II

H. In reference to the level of state funding of education, would you agree or disagree that there should be --

	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Answer	Total Total
Full (100%) state financing with no local add on						
Number	8	2	18	19	3	50
Percent	16.0	4.0	36.0	38.0	6.0	100.0
Full (100%) state financing of specific components (all instructional costs for example)						
Number	8	17	11	11	3	50
Percent	16.0	34.0	22.0	22.0	6.0	100.0
Nearly complete state financing (75-90%)						
Number	13	15	10	9	3	50
Percent	26.0	30.0	20.0	18.0	6.0	100.0
Less than 75% financing						
Number	14	8	7	19	2	50
Percent	28.0	16.0	14.0	38.0	4.0	100.0

I. Greater levels of state funding (as full state funding) will eventually limit local controls and initiatives

Number	20	16	4	8	2	50
Percent	40.0	32.0	8.0	16.0	4.0	100.0

J. A number of plans have been proposed for sharing federal revenues with state and local governments.

One plan is for General Revenue sharing, which would provide funds to state and municipal governments for all public functions. Do you think that your school district will receive its fair share?

	Yes	No	No Answer	Total
Number	8	35	7	50
Percent	16.0	70.0	14.0	100.0

Another plan is for Special Revenue sharing, which would provide funds to states - with "pass through" provisions for federally impacted areas (Type A children) and Title I. Do you think that your school district will receive its fair share?

	Yes	No	No Answer	Total
Number	38	8	4	50
Percent	76.0	16.0	8.0	100.0

TABLE III - DISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS

A. Of the total school population in this city, about what percent of the students fall into the disadvantaged category — economically and socially disadvantaged?

	0-19%	20-39%	40-59%	60-79%	80-100%	No Answer	Total
Number	6	13	12	8	2	9	50
Percent	12.0	26.0	24.0	16.0	4.0	18.0	100.0

B. Does the state provide special educational assistance to this city or other heavily populated areas?

	Yes	No	No Answer	Total
Number	17	29	4	50
Percent	34.0	58.0	8.0	100.0

C. Of the following, what is funded with state special purpose categorical aid funds?

	Funded	Adequately Funded	Not Adequately Funded	No Answer	Total
Transportation					
Number	43	12	30	8	50
Percent	86.0	24.0	60.0	16.0	100.0
Special education					
Number	44	14	30	6	50
Percent	88.0	28.0	60.0	12.0	100.0
Remedial reading					
Number	21	2	19	29	50
Percent	42.0	4.0	38.0	58.0	100.0
For under-privileged low income					
Number	17	1	16	33	50
Percent	34.0	2.0	32.0	66.0	100.0
Vocational education					
Number	40	9	30	11	50
Percent	80.0	18.0	60.0	22.0	100.0
Driver education					
Number	36	17	19	14	50
Percent	72.0	34.0	38.0	28.0	100.0
Construction					
Number	17	2	15	33	50
Percent	34.0	4.0	30.0	66.0	100.0
Density					
Number	7	2	5	43	50
Percent	14.0	4.0	10.0	86.0	100.0

Table III.

D. As an alternative to current patterns for distribution of funds to schools, funds should be provided based on:

	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Answer	Total Total
Educational need						
Number	36	9	1	1	2	50
Percent	72.0	18.0	2.0	2.0	4.0	100.0
Percent of low-income families (inversely related)						
Number	26	16	4	1	2	50
Percent	52.0	32.0	8.0	2.0	4.0	100.0
On achievement scores (inversely related)						
Number	8	8	11	20	2	50
Percent	16.0	16.0	22.0	40.0	4.0	100.0
Socio-economic strata index						
Number	22	12	4	5	6	50
Percent	44.0	24.0	8.0	10.0	12.0	100.0

E. Would you agree that it is better to have more state general purpose aid than categorical aid?

Number	30	3	8	5	4	50
Percent	60.0	6.0	16.0	10.0	8.0	100.0

F. Many studies seem to indicate that compensatory programs for the disadvantaged haven't worked, that is they haven't made much difference. Do you agree with this? (If agree)

	Agree	Disagree	No Answer	Total
Number	18	30	2	50
Percent	36.0	60.0	4.0	100.0

TABLE IV - GOVERNANCE

A. Most big city school systems are really unmanageable.

	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Answer	Total
Number	6	12	6	24	2	50
Percent	12.0	24.0	12.0	48.0	4.0	100.0

B. About what percent of your time (superintendent and staff/school board) is spent on the following:

Educational policy consideration programs, etc.	0	1-20	21-40	41-60	61-80	81-100	No Answer	Total
Number	0	8	8	16	11	6	1	50
Percent	0.0	16.0	16.0	32.0	22.0	12.0	2.0	100.0
Revenue and tax problems								
Number	6	22	16	3	1	1	1	50
Percent	12.0	44.0	32.0	6.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	100.0
Contract negotiations with teachers' unions								
Number	8	34	6	0	0	0	2	50
Percent	16.0	68.0	12.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.0	100.0
Local community concerns								
Number	0	15	20	9	3	2	1	50
Percent	0.0	30.0	40.0	18.0	6.0	4.0	2.0	100.0

C. Regardless of where the funds come from, what controls or decisions must be retained at the local level?

Decisions relating to:	Extremely Important	Somewhat Important	Hardly Important	Not Important	No Answer	Total
Teacher qualifications						
Number	20	13	3	9	5	50
Percent	40.0	26.0	6.0	18.0	10.0	100.0
Hiring and firing of teachers						
Number	46	1	1	0	2	50
Percent	92.0	2.0	2.0	0.0	4.0	100.0
Pupil-teacher ratios						
Number	32	12	4	0	2	50
Percent	64.0	24.0	8.0	0.0	4.0	100.0
Salary schedules						
Number	24	11	4	7	4	50
Percent	48.0	22.0	8.0	14.0	8.0	100.0
Curriculum						
Number	32	14	1	1	2	50
Percent	64.0	28.0	2.0	2.0	4.0	100.0
Facilities						
Number	26	13	2	4	5	50
Percent	52.0	26.0	4.0	8.0	10.0	100.0

Table IV

D. Establishment and negotiation of teachers' salaries at the state level is desirable.

	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Answer	Total
Number	13	8	7	19	3	50
Percent	26.0	16.0	14.0	38.0	6.0	100.0

E. The state should establish standard teacher qualifications and take the responsibility for bringing all teachers in each school system up to that standard.

	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Answer	Total
Number	20	9	8	10	3	50
Percent	40.0	18.0	16.0	20.0	6.0	100.0

F. Would you agree that one of the major efforts of the big city schools should be to strengthen parent and community group involvement in the schools?

	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Answer	Total
Number	48	1	0	0	1	50
Percent	96.0	2.0	0.0	0.0	2.0	100.0
And this involvement should include decisions relating to --						
Teacher qualifications						
Number	16	15	6	12	1	50
Percent	32.0	30.0	12.0	24.0	2.0	100.0
Hiring and firing of teachers						
Number	5	16	7	21	1	50
Percent	10.0	32.0	14.0	42.0	2.0	100.0
Pupil-teacher ratios						
Number	15	25	5	4	1	50
Percent	30.0	50.0	10.0	8.0	2.0	100.0
Salary schedules						
Number	7	16	7	19	1	50
Percent	14.0	32.0	14.0	38.0	2.0	100.0
Curriculum						
Number	26	17	2	4	1	50
Percent	52.0	34.0	4.0	8.0	2.0	100.0
Selection of principals						
Number	15	20	3	10	2	50
Percent	30.0	40.0	6.0	20.0	4.0	100.0
Selection of superintendents						
Number	13	25	1	10	1	50
Percent	26.0	50.0	2.0	20.0	2.0	100.0

Table IV

G. In terms of educational effectiveness, which is most effective?

Rank	First	Second	Third	No Answer	Total
Centralization					
Number	4	21	14	11	50
Percent	8.0	42.0	28.0	22.0	100.0
Decentralization					
Number	36	7	0	7	50
Percent	72.0	14.0	0.0	14.0	100.0
Local community control					
Number	6	12	19	13	50
Percent	12.0	24.0	38.0	26.0	100.0

H. Boards of education should reflect the ethnic and socio-economic composition of the community which the school serves.

	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Answer	Total
Number	32	14	1	3	0	50
Percent	64.0	28.0	2.0	6.0	0.0	100.0
School board members should be elected						
Number	33	4	5	7	1	50
Percent	66.0	8.0	10.0	14.0	2.0	100.0

TABLE V - SPECIAL INNER-CITY ISSUES

A. Providing equal educational opportunities for children in the inner-city schools should be established and implemented as a top priority even though this would mean a disproportionate amount of local funds would have to go to these inner-city schools.

	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Answer	Total
Number	39	6	2	3	0	50
Percent	78.0	12.0	4.0	6.0	0.0	100.0

B. Opinion is mixed as to whether the schools should provide "support services" to students. Should your schools provide the following services

	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Answer	Tota Total
School lunches						
Number	45	3	0	2	0	50
Percent	90.0	6.0	0.0	4.0	0.0	100.0
Medical care						
Number	35	11	2	2	0	50
Percent	70.0	22.0	4.0	4.0	0.0	100.0
Clothing						
Number	23	11	4	12	0	50
Percent	46.0	22.0	8.0	24.0	0.0	100.0

If support services are provided, they should be financed how?

As part of regular education funds	
Number	16
Percent	32.0
As part of local health and welfare program	
Number	35
Percent	70.0

C. Education should be compulsory for all children through age 16 in the inner city school

	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Answer	Total
Number	37	3	6	4	0	50
Percent	74.0	6.0	12.0	8.0	0.0	100.0

Table V.

D. Effectiveness and efficiency of schools should be measured by student progress on achievement tests.

	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Answer	Total
Number	8	10	9	22	1	50
Percent	16.0	20.0	18.0	44.0	2.0	100.0

E. Promotion of students should be based on how they measure against

	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Answer	Total
National norms						
Number	1	6	11	31	1	50
Percent	2.0	12.0	22.0	62.0	2.0	100.0
State norms						
Number	2	8	13	26	1	50
Percent	4.0	16.0	26.0	52.0	2.0	100.0
Local norms						
Number	16	12	5	15	2	50
Percent	32.0	24.0	10.0	30.0	4.0	100.0
Special norms						
Number	14	11	8	14	3	50
Percent	28.0	22.0	16.0	28.0	6.0	100.0
Factors other than "achievement" as measured on tests						
Number	25	15	3	4	3	50
Percent	50.0	30.0	6.0	8.0	6.0	100.0

F. A national assessment program should be set up to establish national achievement norms, and all children should be brought up to those levels.

	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Answer	Total
Number	9	13	8	19	1	50
Percent	18.0	26.0	16.0	38.0	2.0	100.0

G. Each state should establish a minimum acceptable achievement level, and all students should be brought at least to that level

	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Answer	Total
Number	16	13	6	14	1	50
Percent	32.0	26.0	12.0	28.0	2.0	100.0

Table V.

H. Pupil improvement in achievement levels should be used as one of the factors entering into teacher evaluation for salary and promotion purposes.

	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Answer	Total
Number	20	10	7	13	0	50
Percent	40.0	20.0	14.0	26.0	0.0	100.0

I. Who, primarily, should be held accountable for student achievement? Rank in order of accountability

	Mean Rank
1. Teacher	1.74
2. Principal	2.72
3. Superintendent	3.41
4. Parents	4.33
5. School Board	4.46
6. Students	4.51
7. Chief State School Official	6.52

J. By and large, teachers are inadequately prepared to handle the problems of the inner-city school.

	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Answer	Total
Number	23	18	7	1	1	50
Percent	46.0	37.0	14.0	2.0	2.0	100.0

K. Instructional material now used in the inner-city schools adequately reflects the ethnic composition of the student body.

	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Answer	Total
Number	5	14	17	13	1	50
Percent	10.0	28.0	34.0	26.0	2.0	100.0

L. The composition of the teaching staff in inner-city schools should be comparable to that of the student population in a particular school.

	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Answer	Total
Number	10	9	15	16	0	50
Percent	20.0	18.0	30.0	32.0	0.0	100.0

Table V.

M. For teachers entering the inner-city school, practice teaching in these schools should be mandatory.

	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Answer	Total
Number	29	12	5	4	0	50
Percent	58.0	24.0	10.0	8.0	0.0	100.0

N. In-service programs for all teachers in the inner-city school should be mandatory.

	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Answer	Total
Number	42	1	3	3	0	50
Percent	86.0	2.0	6.0	6.0	0.0	100.0

O. In the inner-city school, a higher number of para-professionals should be added to supplement the work of the regular teacher.

	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Answer	Total
Number	44	3	3	0	0	50
Percent	88.0	6.0	6.0	0.0	0.0	100.0

P. High-quality institutions in the inner-city or on the outlying areas would attract students from the suburbs.

	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Answer	Total
Number	11	15	11	13	0	50
Percent	22.0	30.0	22.0	26.0	0.0	100.0

Q. Transfer provisions should be made for children presently attending inner-city schools so they can attend any school of their choice.

	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Answer	Total
Number	31	5	6	8	0	50
Percent	62.0	10.0	12.0	16.0	0.0	100.0

Table V.

R. Where you have racially mixed classes, the overall educational effect is positive for:

	Extremely Positive	Rather Positive	Hardly Positive	Not Positive	No Answer	Total
The disadvantaged child						
Number	8	30	1	2	9	50
Percent	16.0	60.0	2.0	4.0	18.0	100.0
The advantaged child						
Number	15	24	1	2	8	50
Percent	30.0	48.0	2.0	4.0	16.0	100.0

In terms of achievement, the effect is positive for:

	Extremely Positive	Rather Positive	Hardly Positive	Not Positive	No Answer	Total
The disadvantaged child						
Number	12	23	2	2	11	50
Percent	24.0	46.0	4.0	4.0	22.0	100.0
The advantaged child						
Number	7	21	6	5	11	50
Percent	14.0	42.0	12.0	10.0	22.0	100.0

S. Speaking of racially integrated schools, what percentage mix do you think would give the best overall educational results?

Percent Non-Minority

0-30	31-40	41-50	51-60	61-70	71-80	81-90	91-100	No Answer	Total
0	2	0	10	4	4	4	1	25	50
0.0	4.0	0.0	20.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	2.0	50.0	100.0

TABLE VI - EDUCATIONAL INNOVATIONS

A. Education vouchers have been recommended for use by pupils' parents in schools of their choice. In your opinion, the use of this technique would:

	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Answer	Total
Be generally desirable						
Number	3	2	6	36	3	50
Percent	6.0	4.0	12.0	72.0	6.0	100.0
Improve educational effectiveness by making innovations easier						
Number	2	7	9	29	3	50
Percent	4.0	14.0	18.0	58.0	6.0	100.0
Improve parental (taxpayer)satisfaction						
Number	5	21	8	12	4	50
Percent	10.0	42.0	16.0	24.0	8.0	100.0
Increase costs per unit of output						
Number	9	13	8	6	14	50
Percent	18.0	26.0	16.0	12.0	28.0	100.0
Make easier the support of education in non-public schools						
Number	33	9	2	5	1	50
Percent	66.0	18.0	4.0	10.0	2.0	100.0
Unfairly burden the public schools with publicly-financed competition						
Number	18	8	11	6	7	50
Percent	36.0	16.0	22.0	12.0	14.0	100.0
Tend to separate pupils by socio-economic or racial group						
Number	40	4	2	3	1	50
Percent	80.0	8.0	4.0	6.0	2.0	100.0

B. Should education vouchers be used in the inner-city schools?

	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Answer	Total
Number	4	5	5	34	2	50
Percent	8.0	10.0	10.0	68.0	4.0	100.0

Table VL

C. If they are used, parents should be able to send their children to:

	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Answer	Total
Any public school in the present school system						
Number	21	7	3	15	4	50
Percent	42.0	14.0	6.0	30.0	8.0	100.0
Any private school in the present school system						
Number	19	5	4	18	4	50
Percent	38.0	10.0	8.0	36.0	8.0	100.0
Any public school in the surrounding suburbs						
Number	19	8	1	17	5	50
Percent	38.0	16.0	2.0	34.0	10.0	100.0
Any private school in the surrounding suburbs						
Number	19	7	2	17	5	50
Percent	38.0	14.0	4.0	34.0	10.0	100.0

D. Performance contracting is an educational alternative really worth trying on a large scale?

	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Answer	Total
Number	10	13	7	18	2	50
Percent	20.0	26.0	14.0	36.0	4.0	100.0

Performance contracting should be used to a high degree in the inner-city schools.

	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Answer	Total
Number	10	13	11	14	2	50
Percent	20.0	26.0	22.0	28.0	4.0	100.0

Table VI.

E. In your opinion, performance contracting would:

	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Answer	Total
Improve achievement at lower unit cost						
Number	6	10	9	16	9	50
Percent	12.0	20.0	18.0	32.0	18.0	100.0
Improve achievement at higher unit cost						
Number	5	13	11	11	10	50
Percent	10.0	26.0	22.0	22.0	20.0	100.0
Not likely affect pupil achievement						
Number	7	3	19	11	10	50
Percent	14.0	6.0	38.0	22.0	20.0	100.0
Require spending more money, in total						
Number	13	11	9	7	10	50
Percent	26.0	22.0	18.0	14.0	20.0	100.0
Provide a basis for accountability						
Number	20	17	3	8	2	50
Percent	40.0	34.0	60.0	16.0	4.0	100.0

F. Use of the following educational technological devices should be greatly increased in the inner-city schools:

	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Answer	Total
Education television						
Number	35	9	2	3	1	50
Percent	70.0	18.0	4.0	6.0	2.0	100.0
Computer teaching techniques						
Number	25	16	4	3	2	50
Percent	50.0	32.0	8.0	6.0	4.0	100.0
Programmed instruction						
Number	28	16	3	2	1	50
Percent	56.0	32.0	6.0	4.0	2.0	100.0
Audio-visual aids						
Number	37	11	0	0	2	50
Percent	74.0	22.0	0.0	0.0	4.0	100.0

Table VI.

G. High priority should be given to the development of programs like Sesame Street to be used in the inner-city schools

	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Answer	Total
Number	38	9	3	0	0	50
Percent	76.0	18.0	6.0	0.0	0.0	100.0

H. To what extent are these technologies being used in the schools here?

	A Lot	Somewhat	Hardly	Not at All	No Answer	Total
Educational television						
Number	16	19	11	1	3	50
Percent	32.0	38.0	22.0	2.0	6.0	100.0
Computer teaching techniques						
Number	3	21	14	10	2	50
Percent	6	42.0	28.0	20.0	4.0	100.0
Programmed teaching						
Number	10	24	10	1	5	50
Percent	20.0	48.0	20.0	2.0	10.0	100.0
Audio-visual aids						
Number	39	8	0	0	3	50
Percent	78.0	16.0	0.0	0.0	6.0	100.0

I. Would you say the use of educational technological devices have:

	A Lot	Somewhat	Hardly	Not at All	No Answer	Total
Improved achievement						
Number	17	14	8	1	10	50
Percent	34.0	28.0	16.0	2.0	20.0	100.0
Lowered costs per unit of output						
Number	2	6	9	25	8	50
Percent	4.0	12.0	18.0	50.0	10.0	100.0
Depersonalized education						
Number	3	6	5	32	4	50
Percent	6.0	12.0	10.0	64.0	8.0	100.0

J. Every child should have the opportunity to receive pre-school education.

	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Answer	Total
Number	42	4	3	1	0	50
Percent	84.0	8.0	6.0	2.0	0.0	100.0

Table VI.

K. At what age level should pre-school education begin?

	Age 1	Age 2	Age 3	Age 4	No Answer	Total
Number	5	8	20	12	5	50
Percent	10.0	16.0	40.0	24.0	10.0	100.0

L. In the inner-city the development of community schools as the focal point for community needs (i.e., housing, welfare, health) should be encouraged.

	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Answer	Total
Number	37	11	2	0	0	50
Percent	74.0	22.0	4.0	0.0	0.0	100.0

M. A fixed percentage of all funds provided to the inner-city schools should be set aside for new experimental programs, such as the development of street academies, etc.

	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Answer	Total
Number	19	12	7	11	1	50
Percent	38.0	24.0	14.0	22.0	2.0	100.0

N. To families who qualify for family assistance, a financial incentive should be paid for every child who remains in school and graduates from high school.

	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Answer	Total
Number	10	10	10	17	3	50
Percent	20.0	20.0	20.0	34.0	6	100.0

TABLE VII - NON-PUBLIC SCHOOLS

A. If the non-public schools close down because of financial difficulties, the burden upon the taxpayer will be greater since the public schools will have to absorb these children, therefore, it is better to provide funds directly to non-public schools.

	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somehwat Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Answer	Total
Number	5	6	8	25	6	50
Percent	10.0	12.0	16.0	50.0	12.0	100.0

B. Rather than provide funds for non-public schools, the states should be ready to assist any public school faced with sharp increased enrollments resulting.

	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Answer	Total
Number	33	7	5	1	4	50
Percent	66.0	14.0	10.0	2.0	8.0	100.0

C. Would you agree that your public schools have the ability to absorb non-public students.

	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Answer	Total
Number	26	11	6	4	3	50
Percent	52.0	22.0	12.0	8.0	6.0	100.0

U. S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE : 1972 O - 454-956